

Error Autocorrection in Rational Approximation and Interval Estimates

Grigori L. Litvinov *

*Independent University of Moscow
B. Vlasievskii per., 11, Moscow 121002, Russia
E-mail: islc@dol.ru and glitvinov@mail.ru*

Abstract

The error autocorrection effect means that in a calculation all the intermediate errors compensate each other, so the final result is much more accurate than the intermediate results. In this case standard interval estimates (in the framework of interval analysis including the so-called a posteriori interval analysis of Yu. Matijasevich) are too pessimistic. We shall discuss a very strong form of the effect which appears in rational approximations to functions.

The error autocorrection effect occurs in all efficient methods of rational approximation (e.g., best approximations, Padé approximations, multipoint Padé approximations, linear and nonlinear Padé-Chebyshev approximations, etc.), where very significant errors in the approximant coefficients do not affect the accuracy of this approximant. The reason is that the errors in the coefficients of the rational approximant are not distributed in an arbitrary way, but form a collection of coefficients for a new rational approximant to the same approximated function. The understanding of this mechanism allows to

*Partly supported by the Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences (Toronto, Canada).

decrease the approximation error by varying the approximation procedure depending on the form of the approximant. Results of computer experiments are presented.

The effect of error autocorrection indicates that variations of an approximated function under some deformations of rather a general type may have little effect on the corresponding rational approximant viewed as a function (whereas the coefficients of the approximant can have very significant changes). Accordingly, while deforming a function for which good rational approximation is possible, the corresponding approximant's error can rapidly increase, so the property of having good rational approximation is not stable under small deformations of the approximated functions. This property is "individual", in the sense that it holds for specific functions.

Keywords: error autocorrection, rational approximation, algorithms, interval estimates.

AMS Subject classification: 41A20, 65Gxx.

1 Introduction

The paper contains a brief survey description of results published in [1]–[7] (but not all of them) and a new material on a general form of the error autocorrection effect and its relation to interval analysis in the spirit of [8]–[10]. Some old results are presented in a new form. The treatment is partly heuristic and it is based on computer experiments.

The error autocorrection effect means that in a calculation all the intermediate calculating errors compensate each other, so the final result is much more accurate than the intermediate results. In this case standard interval estimates (e.g., in the framework of Yu. Matijasevich's a posteriori interval analysis) are not realistic, they are too pessimistic. The error autocorrection effect appears in some popular numerical methods, e.g., in the least squares method. In principle this effect is not new for experts in interval computations. We shall discuss a very strong form of the effect.

For the sake of simplicity let us suppose that we calculate values of a real smooth function $z = F(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ of real variables $y_1, \dots, y_n$, and suppose that all round-off errors are negligible with respect to input data errors. In

this case the error ΔF of the function F can be evaluated by the formula

$$\Delta F = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \cdot \Delta y_i + r,$$

where r is negligible. The sum $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \cdot \Delta y_i$ in this formula can be treated as a scalar product of the gradient vector $\{\frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i}\}$ and the vector of errors $\{\Delta y_i\}$. For all the standard interval methods the best possible estimate for ΔF is given by the formula

$$|\Delta F| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \right| \cdot |\Delta y_i|.$$

This estimate is too pessimistic if both the vectors $\{\frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i}\}$ and $\{\Delta y_i\}$ are not small but the scalar product is small enough, so these vectors are almost orthogonal. That is the case of the error autocorrection effect. To calculate values of a function we usually use four arithmetic operations (applying to arguments and constants) and this leads to a rational approximation to the calculated function.

The author came across the phenomenon of error autocorrection at the end of seventies while developing nonstandard algorithms for computing elementary functions on small computers. It was required to construct rational approximants of the form

$$R(x) = \frac{a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n}{b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots + b_mx^m} \quad (1)$$

to certain functions of one variable x defined on finite segments of the real line. For this purpose a simple method (described in [1] and below) was used: the method allows to determine the family of coefficients a_i, b_j of the approximant (1) as a solution of a certain system of linear algebraic equations. These systems turned out to be ill conditioned, i.e., the problem of determining the coefficients of the approximant is, generally speaking, ill-posed and small perturbations of the approximated function $f(x)$ or calculation errors lead to very significant errors in the values of coefficients. Nevertheless, the method ensures a paradoxically high quality of the obtained approximants whose errors are close to the best possible [1, 2].

For example, for the function $\cos x$ the approximant of the form (1) on the segment $[-\pi/4, \pi/4]$ obtained by the method mentioned above for $m = 4$,

$n = 6$ has the relative error equal to $0.55 \cdot 10^{-13}$, and the best possible relative error is $0.46 \cdot 10^{-13}$ [11]. The corresponding system of linear algebraic equations has the condition number of order 10^9 . Thus we risk to lose 9 accurate decimal digits in the solution because of calculation errors. Computer experiments show that this is a serious risk. The method mentioned above was implemented as a Fortran program. The calculations were carried out with double precision (16 decimal positions) by means of two different computers. These computers are very similar in their architecture, but when passing from one computer to another the system of linear equations and the computational process are perturbed because of calculation errors, including round-off errors. As a result, the coefficients of the approximant mentioned above to the function $\cos x$ experience a perturbation already at the sixth–ninth decimal digits. But the error in the rational approximant itself remains invariant and is $0.4 \cdot 10^{-13}$ for the absolute error and $0.55 \cdot 10^{-13}$ for the relative error. The same thing happens for approximants of the form (1) to the function $\arctan x$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$ obtained by the method mentioned above for $m = 8$, $n = 9$ the relative error is $0.5 \cdot 10^{-11}$ and does not change while passing from one computer to another although the corresponding system of linear equations has the condition number of order 10^{11} , and the coefficients of the approximant experience a perturbation with a relative error of order 10^{-4} .

Thus the errors in the numerator and the denominator of a rational approximant compensate each other. The effect of error autocorrection is connected with the fact that the errors in the coefficients of a rational approximant are not distributed in an arbitrary way, but form the coefficients of a new approximant to the approximated function. It can be easily understood that all standard methods of interval arithmetic (see, for example, [6], [8]–[10]) do not allow us to take into account this effect and, as a result, to estimate the error in the rational approximant accurately (see section 12 below).

Note that the application of standard procedures known in the theory of ill-posed problems results in this case in losses in accuracy. For example, if one applies the regularization method, then two thirds of the accurate figures are lost [12]; in addition, the amount of calculations increases rapidly. The matter of import is that the exact solution of the system of equations in the present case is not the ultimate goal; the aim is to construct an approximant which is precise enough. This approach allows to “rehabilitate” (i.e., to

justify) and to simplify a number of algorithms intended for the construction of the approximant, to obtain (without additional transforms) approximants in a form which is convenient for applications.

Professor Yudell L. Luke kindly drew the author's attention to his papers [13, 14] where the effect of error autocorrection for the classical Padé approximants was revealed and was explained at a heuristic level. The method mentioned above leads to the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants if the calculation errors are ignored.

In the present paper the error autocorrection mechanism is considered for quite a general situation (including linear methods for the construction of rational approximants and nonlinear generalized Padé approximations). The efficiency of the construction algorithms used for rational approximants is due to the error autocorrection effect (at least in the case when the number of coefficients is large enough).

Our new understanding of the error autocorrection mechanism allows us, to some extent, to control calculation errors by changing the construction procedure depending on the form of the approximant. It is shown that the appearance of a control parameter allowing to take into account the error autocorrection mechanism ensures the decrease of the calculation errors in some cases.

Construction methods for linear and nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximants involving the computer algebra system REDUCE (see [4]) are also briefly described. Computation results characterizing the comparative precision of these methods are given. With regard to the error autocorrection phenomenon the effect described in [2] and connected with the fact that a small variation of an approximated function can lead to a sharp decrease in accuracy of the Padé–Chebyshev approximants is analyzed.

The error autocorrection effect occurs not only in rational approximation but appears in some other cases (approximate solutions of linear differential equations, the method of least squares etc.). In this more general situation relations between the error autocorrection effect and standard methods of interval analysis are also discussed in this paper.

The author is grateful to Y.L. Luke, B.S. Dobronets, and S.P. Shary for stimulating discussions and comments. The author wishes to express his thanks to I. A. Andreeva, A. Ya. Rodionov and V. N. Fridman who participated in the programming and organization of computer experiments.

2 Error autocorrection in rational approximation

Let $\{\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ and $\{\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_m\}$ be two collections consisting of linearly independent functions of the argument x belonging to some (possibly multidimensional) set X . Consider the problem of constructing an approximant of the form

$$R(x) = \frac{a_0\varphi_0 + a_1\varphi_1 + \dots + a_n\varphi_n}{b_0\psi_0 + b_1\psi_1 + \dots + b_m\psi_m} \quad (2)$$

to a given function $f(x)$ defined on X . If X coincides with a real line segment $[A, B]$ and if $\varphi_k = x^k$ and $\psi_k = x^k$ for all k , then the expression (2) turns out to be a rational function of the form (1) (see the Introduction). It is clear that expression (2) also gives a rational function in the case when we take Chebyshev polynomials T_k or, for example, Legendre, Laguerre, Hermite, etc. polynomials as φ_k and ψ_k .

Fix an abstract construction method for an approximant of the form (2) and consider the problem of computing the coefficients a_i, b_j . Quite often this problem is ill-conditioned (ill-posed). For example, the problem of computing coefficients for best rational approximants (including polynomial approximants) for high degrees of the numerator or the denominator is ill-conditioned.

The instability with respect to the calculation error can be related both to the abstract construction method of approximation (i.e., with the formulation of the problem) and to the particular algorithm implementing the method. The fact that the problem of computing coefficients for the best approximant is ill-conditioned is related to the formulation of this problem. This is also valid for other construction methods for rational approximants with a sufficiently large number of coefficients. But an unfortunate choice of the algorithm implementing a certain method can aggravate troubles connected with ill-conditioning.

Let the coefficients a_i, b_j give an exact or an approximate solution of this problem, and let the $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_j$ give another approximate solution obtained in the same way. Denote by $\Delta a_i, \Delta b_j$ the absolute errors of the coefficients, i.e., $\Delta a_i = \tilde{a}_i - a_i, \Delta b_j = \tilde{b}_j - b_j$; these errors arise due to perturbations of the

approximated function $f(x)$ or due to calculation errors. Set

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) &= \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \varphi_i, & Q(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^m b_j \psi_j, \\ \Delta P(x) &= \sum_{i=0}^n \Delta a_i \varphi_i, & \Delta Q(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^m \Delta b_j \psi_j, \\ \tilde{P}(x) &= P + \Delta P, & \tilde{Q}(x) &= Q + \Delta Q. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that the following exact equality is valid:

$$\frac{P + \Delta P}{Q + \Delta Q} - \frac{P}{Q} = \frac{\Delta Q}{Q} \left(\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q} - \frac{P}{Q} \right). \quad (3)$$

As mentioned in the Introduction, the fact that the problem of calculating coefficients is ill-conditioned can nevertheless be accompanied by high accuracy of the approximants obtained. This means that the approximants P/Q and $\tilde{P}/\tilde{Q}$ are close to the approximated function and, therefore, are close to each other, although the coefficients of these approximants differ greatly. In this case the relative error $\Delta Q/\tilde{Q} = \Delta Q/(Q + \Delta Q)$ of the denominator considerably exceeds in absolute value the left-hand side of equality (3). This is possible only in the case when the difference $\Delta P/\Delta Q - P/Q$ is small, i.e., the function $\Delta P/\Delta Q$ is close to P/Q , and, hence, to the approximated function. Thus the function $\Delta P/\Delta Q$ will be called the *error approximant*. For a special case, this concept was actually introduced in [13]. For "efficient" methods, the error approximant provides indeed a good approximation for the approximated function and, thus, P/Q and $\tilde{P}/\tilde{Q}$ differ from each other by a product of small quantities in the right-hand side of (3).

Usually the following "**uncertainty relation**" is valid:

$$\Delta \left(\frac{P}{Q} \right) = \delta Q \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q} - \frac{P}{Q} \right) \approx \delta Q \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q} - f \right) \sim \varepsilon,$$

where $\delta Q = \frac{\Delta Q}{Q + \Delta Q}$ is the relative error of the denominator Q , the difference $\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q} - f$ is the absolute error of the error approximate $\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q}$ to the function f , and ε is the absolute "theoretical" error of our method; the argument x can be treated as fixed.

Usually the approximation function $f(x)$ is treated as an element of a Banach space with a norm $\|\cdot\|$ and the absolute error Δ of the approximant (2) is defined as $\Delta = \|f - \frac{P}{Q}\|$; so its relative error δ is defined as $\delta = \|(f - \frac{P}{Q})/f\|$ or $\delta = \|(f - \frac{P}{Q})/\frac{P}{Q}\|$. In what follows, we shall consider the

space $C[A, B]$ of all continuous functions defined on the real line segment $[A, B]$ with the norm

$$\|f(x)\| = \max_{A \leq x \leq B} |f(x)|.$$

Below we discuss examples of the error autocorrection effect for linear and nonlinear methods of rational approximation.

3 Error autocorrection for linear methods in rational approximation

Several construction methods for approximants of the form (2) are connected with solving systems of linear algebraic equations. This procedure can lead to a large error if the corresponding matrix is ill-conditioned. Consider an arbitrary system of linear algebraic equations

$$Ay = h, \tag{4}$$

where A is a given square matrix of order N with components a_{ij} ($i, j = 1, \dots, N$), h is a given vector column with components h_i , and y is an unknown vector column with components y_i . Define the vector norm by the equality

$$\|y\| = \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i|$$

(this norm is more convenient for calculations than $\sqrt{x_1^2 + \dots + x_N^2}$). Then the matrix norm is determined by the equality

$$\|A\| = \max_{\|y\|=1} \|Ay\| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|a_{ij}\|.$$

If a matrix A is nonsingular, then the quantity

$$\text{cond}(A) = \|A\| \cdot \|A^{-1}\| \tag{5}$$

is called the *condition number* of the matrix A (see, for example, [15]). Since $y = A^{-1}h$, we see that the absolute error Δy of the vector y is connected with the absolute error of the vector h by the relation $\Delta y = A^{-1}\Delta h$, whence

$$\|\Delta y\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\Delta h\|$$

and

$$\|\Delta y\|/\|y\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \cdot (\|h\|/\|y\|)(\|\Delta h\|/\|h\|).$$

Taking into account the fact that $\|h\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|y\|$, we finally obtain

$$\|\Delta y\|/\|y\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\Delta h\|/\|h\|, \quad (6)$$

i.e., the relative error of the solution y is estimated via the relative error of the vector h by means of the condition number. It is clear that (6) can turn into an equality. Thus, if the condition number is of order 10^k , then, because of round-off errors in h , we can lose k decimal digits of y .

The contribution of the error of the matrix A is evaluated similarly. Finally, the dependence of $\text{cond}(A)$ on the choice of a norm is weak. A method of rapid estimation of the condition number is described in [15], Section 3.2.

Let an abstract construction method for the approximant of the form (2) be linear in the sense that the coefficients of the approximant can be determined from a homogeneous system of linear algebraic equations. The homogeneity condition is connected with the fact that, when multiplying the numerator and the denominator of fraction (2) by the same nonzero number, the approximant (2) does not change. Denote by y the vector whose components are the coefficients $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m$. Assume that the coefficients can be obtained from the homogeneous system of equations

$$Hy = 0, \quad (7)$$

where H is a matrix of dimension $(m + n + 2) \times (m + n + 1)$.

The vector $\tilde{y}$ is an approximate solution of system (7) if the quantity $\|H\tilde{y}\|$ is small. If y and $\tilde{y}$ are approximate solutions of system (7), then the vector $\Delta y = \tilde{y} - y$ is also an approximate solution of this system since $\|H\Delta y\| = \|H\tilde{y} - Hy\| \leq \|H\tilde{y}\| + \|Hy\|$. Thus it is natural to assume that the function $\Delta P/\Delta Q$ corresponding to the solution Δy is an approximant to $f(x)$. It is clear that the order of the residual of the approximate solution Δy of system (7), i.e., of the quantity $\|H\Delta y\|$, coincides with the order of the largest of the residuals of the approximate solutions y and $\tilde{y}$. For a fixed order of the residual the increase of the error Δy is compensated by the fact that Δy satisfies the system of equations (7) with greater “relative” accuracy, and the latter, generally speaking, leads to the increase of accuracy of the error approximant.

To obtain a certain solution of system (7), one usually adds to this system a normalization condition of the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \lambda_i a_i + \sum_{j=0}^m \mu_j b_j = 1, \quad (8)$$

where λ_i, μ_j are numerical coefficients. As a rule, the relation $b_0 = 1$ is taken as the normalization condition (but this is not always successful with respect to minimizing the calculation errors).

Adding equation (8) to system (7), we obtain a nonhomogeneous system of $m+n+2$ linear algebraic equations of type (4). If the approximate solutions y and $\tilde{y}$ of system (7) satisfy condition (8), then the vector Δy satisfies the condition

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \lambda_i \Delta a_i + \sum_{j=0}^m \mu_j \Delta b_j = 0. \quad (9)$$

Of course, the above reasoning is not very rigorous; for each specific construction method for approximations it is necessary to carry out some additional analysis. More accurate arguments are given below for the linear and nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximants. The presence of the error autocorrection mechanism described above is also verified by numerical experiments (see below).

It is clear, that classical Padé approximations, multipoint Padé approximations, linear generalized Padé approximations in sense of [16] (e.g., linear Padé–Chebyshev approximations) give us good examples of linear methods in rational approximation. From our point of view, methods of the best approximations can be treated as linear. The thing is that the coefficients of the best Chebyshev approximant satisfy a system of linear algebraic equations and are computed as approximate solutions of this system on the last step of the iteration process in algorithms of Remez’s type (see [7, 17] for details). Thus, the construction methods for the best rational approximants can be regarded as linear. At least for some functions (say, for $\cos((\pi/4)x)$, $-1 \leq x \leq 1$) the linear and the nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximants are very close to the best ones in the sense of the relative and the absolute errors, respectively. The results that arise when applying calculation algorithms for Padé–Chebyshev approximants can be regarded as approximate solutions of the system which determines the best approximants. Thus the presence of the effect of error autocorrection for Padé–Chebyshev approximants gives an

additional argument in favor of the conjecture that this effect also takes place for the best approximants.

Finally, note that the basic relation (3) becomes meaningless if one seeks an approximant in the form $a_0\varphi_0 + a_1\varphi_1 + \dots + a_n\varphi_n$, i.e., the denominator in (2) is reduced to 1. However, in this case the effect of error autocorrection (although much weakened) is also possible; this is connected with the fact that the errors Δa_i approximately satisfy certain relations. Such a situation can arise when using the least squares method.

4 Linear Padé–Chebyshev approximations and the PADE program

Let us start to discuss a series of examples. Consider the approximant of the form (1)

$$R_{m,n}(x) = \frac{a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n}{b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots + b_mx^m} \quad (10)$$

to a function $f(x)$ defined on the segment $[-1, 1]$. The absolute error function

$$\Delta(x) = f(x) - R_{m,n}(x)$$

obviously has the following form:

$$\Delta(x) = \Phi(x)/Q_m(x),$$

where

$$\Phi(x) = f(x)Q_m(x) - P_n(x). \quad (11)$$

The function $R_{m,n}(x) = P_n(x)/Q_m(x)$ is called the *linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant to the function $f(x)$* if

$$\int_{-1}^1 \Phi(x)T_k(x)w(x)dx = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, m+n, \quad (12)$$

where $T_k(x) = \cos(k \arccos x)$ are the Chebyshev polynomials, $w(x) = 1/\sqrt{1-x^2}$. This concept allows a generalization to the case of other orthogonal polynomials (see, e.g., [16], [18]–[20]). Approximants of this kind always exist [18].

The system of equations (12) is equivalent to the following system of linear algebraic equations with respect to the coefficients a_i , b_j :

$$\sum_{j=0}^m b_j \int_{-1}^1 \frac{x^j T_k(x) f(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx - \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \int_{-1}^1 \frac{x^i T_k(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = 0. \quad (13)$$

The homogeneous system (12) can be transformed into a nonhomogeneous one by adding a normalization condition; in particular, any of the following relations can be taken as this condition:

$$b_0 = 1, \quad (14)$$

$$b_m = 1, \quad (15)$$

$$a_m = 1. \quad (16)$$

In [1, 2] the program PADE (in Fortran, with double precision) which allows us to construct rational approximants by solving the system of equations of type (13) is briefly described. The complete text of a certain version of this program and its detailed description can be found in the Collection of algorithms and programs of the Research Computer Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences [3]. For even functions the approximant is looked for in the form

$$R(x) = \frac{a_0 + a_1 x^2 + \dots + a_n (x^2)^n}{b_0 + b_1 x^2 + \dots + b_m (x^2)^m}, \quad (17)$$

and for odd functions it is looked for in the form

$$R(x) = x \frac{a_0 + a_1 x^2 + \dots + a_n (x^2)^n}{b_0 + b_1 x^2 + \dots + b_m (x^2)^m}, \quad (18)$$

respectively. The program computes the values of coefficients of the approximant, the absolute and the relative errors $\Delta = \max_{A \leq x \leq B} |\Delta(x)|$ and $\delta = \max_{A \leq x \leq B} |\Delta(x)/f(x)|$, and gives the information which allows us to estimate the quality of the approximation (see [7] and [3] for details). Using a subroutine, the user introduces the function defined by means of any algorithm on an arbitrary segment $[A, B]$, introduces the boundary points of this segment, the numbers m and n , and the number of control parameters. In particular, one can choose the normalization condition of type (14)–(16), look for an approximant in the form (17) or (18) and so on. The change of

the variable reduces the approximation on any segment $[A, B]$ to the approximation on the segment $[-1, 1]$. Therefore, we shall consider the case when $A = -1$, $B = 1$ in the sequel unless otherwise stated.

For the calculation of integrals, the Gauss–Hermite–Chebyshev quadrature formula is used:

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{\varphi(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \frac{\pi}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \varphi\left(\cos \frac{2i-1}{2s}\pi\right), \quad (19)$$

where s is the number of interpolation points; for polynomials of degree $2s-1$ this formula is exact, so the precision of formula (19) increases rapidly as the parameter s increases and depends on the quality of the approximation of the function $\varphi(s)$ by polynomials. To calculate the values of Chebyshev polynomials, the well-known recurrence relation is applied.

If the function $f(x)$ is even and an approximant is looked for the form (17), then system (13) is transformed into the following system of equations:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n a_i \int_{-1}^1 \frac{x^{2i} T_{2k}(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx - \sum_{j=0}^m b_j \int_{-1}^1 \frac{x^{2j} T_{2k}(x) f(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = 0, \quad (20)$$

where $k = 0, 1, \dots, m+n$. If $f(x)$ is an odd function and an approximant is looked for in the form (18), then, first, by means of the solution of system (20) complemented by one of the normalization conditions, one determines an approximant of the form (17) to the even function $f(x)/x$, and then the obtained approximant is multiplied by x . This procedure allows us to avoid a large relative error for $x = 0$.

This algorithm is rather simple; for its implementation only two standard subroutines are needed (for solving systems of linear algebraic equations and for numerical integration). However, the algorithm is efficient.

The possibilities of the PADE program are demonstrated in Table 1. This table contains errors of certain approximants obtained by means of this program.

Table 1

Function	m	n	Δ	δ	$\delta_{\min}$
$\sqrt{x}$	2	2	$0.8 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$1.13 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$0.6 \cdot 10^{-6}$
$\sqrt{x}$	3	3	$1.9 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$2.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.12 \cdot 10^{-9}$
$\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$	0	3	$0.28 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.39 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.32 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$	1	2	$0.24 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.34 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.29 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$	2	2	$0.69 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$0.94 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$0.79 \cdot 10^{-10}$
$\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$	0	5	$0.57 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.79 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.66 \cdot 10^{-13}$
$\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$	2	3	$0.4 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.55 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.46 \cdot 10^{-13}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{4}x$	0	4	$0.34 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.48 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.47 \cdot 10^{-11}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{4}x$	2	2	$0.32 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.45 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.44 \cdot 10^{-11}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{4}x$	0	5	$0.36 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$0.55 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$0.45 \cdot 10^{-14}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{2}x$	1	1	$0.14 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$0.14 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$0.12 \cdot 10^{-3}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{2}x$	0	4	$0.67 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.67 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.54 \cdot 10^{-8}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{2}x$	2	2	$0.63 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.63 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.53 \cdot 10^{-8}$
$\sin \frac{\pi}{2}x$	3	3	$0.63 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.63 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.5 \cdot 10^{-13}$
$\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$	1	1	$0.64 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$0.64 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$0.57 \cdot 10^{-5}$
$\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$	2	1	$0.16 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.16 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.14 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$	2	2	$0.25 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$0.25 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$0.22 \cdot 10^{-10}$
$\arctan x$	0	7	$0.75 \cdot 10^{-7}$	10^{-7}	10^{-7}
$\arctan x$	2	3	$0.16 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.51 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.27 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$\arctan x$	0	9	$0.15 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.28 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$0.23 \cdot 10^{-8}$
$\arctan x$	3	3	$0.54 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.9 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$0.87 \cdot 10^{-9}$
$\arctan x$	4	4	$0.12 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.48 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$0.17 \cdot 10^{-11}$
$\arctan x$	5	4	$0.75 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$0.71 \cdot 10^{-13}$

For every approximant, the absolute error Δ , the relative error δ , and (for comparison) the best possible relative error $\delta_{\min}$ taken from [11] are indicated. The function $\sqrt{x}$ is approximated on the segment $[1/2, 1]$ by the expression of the form (1), the function $\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$ is approximated on the segment $[-1, 1]$ by the expression of the form (17), and all the others are approximated on the same segment by the expression of the form (18).

5 Error autocorrection for the PADE program

The condition numbers of systems of equations that arise while calculating, by means of the PADE program, the approximants considered above are very large: for example, while calculating the approximant of the form (18) on the segment $[-1, 1]$ to $\sin \frac{\pi}{2}x$ for $m = n = 3$, the corresponding condition number is of order 10^{13} . As a result, the coefficients of the approximant are determined with a large error. In particular, a small perturbation of the system of linear equations arising when passing from one computer to another (because of the calculation errors) gives rise to large perturbations in the coefficients of the approximant. Fortunately, the effect of error autocorrection improves the situation, and the errors of the approximant have no substantial changes under this perturbation. This fact is described in the Introduction, where concrete examples are also given.

Consider some more examples connected with passing from one computer to another (see [6, 7] for details). The branch of the algorithm which corresponds to the normalization condition (14) (i.e., to $b_0 = 1$) is considered. For $\arctan x$ the calculation of an approximant of the form (18) on the segment $[-1, 1]$ for $m = n = 5$ gave an approximant with the absolute error $\Delta = 0.35 \cdot 10^{-12}$ and the relative error $\delta = 0.16 \cdot 10^{-11}$. The corresponding system of linear algebraic equations has the condition number of order 10^{30} ! Passing to another computer we obtain the following: $\Delta = 0.5 \cdot 10^{-14}$, $\delta = 0.16 \cdot 10^{-12}$, the condition number is of order 10^{14} , and the errors Δa_1 and Δb_1 in the coefficients a_1 and b_1 in (18) are greater in absolute value than 1! This example shows that the problem of computing the condition number of an ill-conditioned system is, in its turn, ill-conditioned. Indeed, the condition number is, roughly speaking, determined by values of coefficients of the inverse matrix, every column of the inverse matrix being the solution of the system of equations with the initial matrix of coefficients, i.e., of an ill-conditioned system.

Consider in detail the effect of error autocorrection for the approximant of the form (17) on the segment $[-1, 1]$ to the function $\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$ for $m = 2$, $n = 3$. For our two different computers, two different approximants were obtained with the coefficients a_i, b_i and $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i$ respectively. In the both cases the calculation number is of order 10^9 , absolute error $\delta = 0.55 \cdot 10^{-13}$; these

errors are closed to the best possible. The coefficients of the approximants obtained by means of the computers mentioned above and the coefficients of the error approximant (see Section 3 above) are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_0 &= 0.9999999999999600, & a_0 &= 0.9999999999999610, \\
\Delta a_0 &= -10^{-15}, \\
\tilde{a}_1 &= -0.2925310453579570, & a_1 &= -0.2925311264716216, \\
\Delta a_1 &= 10^{-7} \cdot 0.811136646, \\
\tilde{a}_2 &= 10^{-1} \cdot 0.1105254254716866, & a_2 &= 10^{-1} \cdot 0.1105256585556549, \\
\Delta a_2 &= -10^{-7} \cdot 0.2330839683, \\
\tilde{a}_3 &= 10^{-3} \cdot 0.1049474500904401, & a_3 &= 10^{-3} \cdot 0.1049482094850086, \\
\Delta a_3 &= 10^{-9} \cdot 0.7593947685, \\
b_0 &= 1, & \tilde{b}_0 &= 1, \\
\Delta b_0 &= 0, \\
\tilde{b}_1 &= 10^{-1} \cdot 0.1589409217324021, & b_1 &= 10^{-1} \cdot 0.1589401105960337, \\
\Delta b_1 &= 10^{-7} \cdot 0.8111363684, \\
\tilde{b}_2 &= 10^{-3} \cdot 0.1003359011092697, & b_2 &= 10^{-3} \cdot 0.1003341918083529, \\
\Delta b_2 &= 10^{-8} \cdot 0.17093009168.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the error approximant has the form

$$\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q} = \frac{\Delta a_0 + \Delta a_1 x^2 + \Delta a_2 x^4 + \Delta a_3 x^6}{\Delta b_1 x^2 + \Delta b_2 x^4}. \quad (21)$$

If the relatively small quantity $\Delta a_0 = -10^{-15}$ in (21) is omitted, then, as testing by means of a computer shows (2000 checkpoints), this expression is an approximant to the function $\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$ with the absolute and the relative errors $\Delta = \delta = 0.22 \cdot 10^{-6}$.

But the polynomial ΔQ is zero at $x = 0$, and the polynomial ΔP takes a small, but nonzero value at $x = 0$. Fortunately, relation (3) can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\frac{\tilde{P}}{\tilde{Q}} - \frac{P}{Q} = \frac{\Delta P}{\tilde{Q}} - \frac{\Delta Q}{\tilde{Q}} \cdot \frac{P}{Q}. \quad (22)$$

Thus, as $\Delta Q \rightarrow 0$, the effect of error autocorrection arises because the quantity ΔP is close to zero, and the error of the approximant P/Q is determined by the error of the coefficient a_0 . The same situation also takes place when the polynomial ΔQ vanishes at an arbitrary point x_0 belonging to the segment $[A, B]$ where the function is approximated. It is clear that if one chooses the standard normalization ($b_0 = 1$), then the error approximant has actually two coefficients less than the initial one. It is clear that in the general case the normalization conditions $a_n = 1$ or $b_m = 1$ result in the following: the coefficients of the error approximant form an approximate solution of the homogeneous system of linear algebraic equations whose exact solution determines the Padé–Chebyshev approximant having one coefficient less than the initial one. The effect of error autocorrection improves again the accuracy of this error approximant; thus, “the snake bites its own tail”. A situation also arises in the case when the approximant of the form (17) to an even function is constructed by solving the system of equations (20).

Sometimes it is possible to decrease the error of the approximant by means of the fortunate choice of the normalization condition. As an example, consider the approximation of the function e^x on the segment $[-1, 1]$ by rational functions of the form (1) for $m = 15$, $n = 0$. For the traditionally accepted normalization $b_0 = 1$, the PADE program yields an approximant with the absolute error $\Delta = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ and the relative error $\delta = 0.53 \cdot 10^{-14}$. After passing to the normalization condition $b_{15} = 1$, the errors are reduced nearly one half: $\Delta = 0.73 \cdot 10^{-14}$, $\delta = 0.27 \cdot 10^{-14}$. Note that the condition number increases: in the first case it is $2 \cdot 10^6$, and in the second case it is $6 \cdot 10^{16}$. Thus the error decreases notwithstanding the fact that the system of equations becomes drastically ill-conditioned. This example shows that the increase of accuracy of the error approximant can be accompanied by the increase of the condition number, and, as experiments show, by the increase of errors of the numerator and the denominator of the approximant. The fortunate choice of the normalization condition depends on the particular situation.

A specific situation arises when the degree of the numerator (or of the denominator) of the approximant is equal to zero. In this case the unfortunate choice of the normalization condition results in the following: the error approximant becomes zero or is not well-defined. For $n = 0$ it is expedient to choose condition (15), as it was done in the example given above. For $m = 0$ (the case of the polynomial approximation) it is usually expedient to choose

condition (16).

One could seek the numerator and the denominator of the approximant in the form

$$P = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i T_i, \quad Q = \sum_{j=0}^m b_j T_j, \quad (23)$$

where T_i are the Chebyshev polynomials. In this case the system of linear equations determining the coefficients would be better conditioned. But the calculation of the polynomials of the form (23) by, for example, the Chen-shaw method, results in lengthening the computation time, although it has a favorable effect upon the error of calculations. The transformation of the polynomials P and Q from the form (23) into the standard form also requires additional efforts.

In practice it is more convenient to use approximants represented in the form (1), (17), or (18), and calculate the fraction's numerator and denominator according the Horner scheme. In this case the normalization $a_n = 1$ or $b_m = 1$ allows to reduce the number of multiplications.

The use of the algorithm does not require that the approximated function be expanded into a series or a continued fraction beforehand. Equations (12) or (13) and the quadrature formula (19) show that the algorithm uses only the values of the approximated function $f(x)$ at the interpolation points of the quadrature formula (which are zeros of some Chebyshev polynomial).

On the segment $[-1, 1]$ the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants give a considerably smaller error than the classical Padé approximants. For example, the Padé approximant of the form (1) to the function e^x for $m = n = 2$ has the absolute error $\Delta(1) = 4 \cdot 10^{-3}$ at the point $x = 1$, but the PADE program gives an approximant of the same form with the absolute error $\Delta = 1.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ (on the entire the segment), i.e., the latter is 20 times smaller than the previous one. The absolute error of the best approximant is $0.87 \cdot 10^{-4}$.

6 The “cross-multiplied” linear Padé–Chebyshev approximation

As a rule, linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants are constructed according to the following scheme, see, e.g., [21, 11, 16]. Let the approximated function

be decomposed into the series in Chebyshev polynomials

$$f(x) = \sum'_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i T_i(x) = \frac{1}{2}c_0 + c_1 T_1(x) + c_2 T_2(x) + \dots, \quad (24)$$

where the notation $\sum'_{i=0}^m$ means that the first term u_0 in the sum is replaced by $u_0/2$. The rational approximant is looked for in the form

$$R(x) = \frac{\sum'_{i=0}^n a_i T_i(x)}{\sum'_{j=0}^m b_j T_j(x)}; \quad (25)$$

the coefficients b_j are determined by means of the system of linear algebraic equations

$$\sum'_{j=0}^m b_j (c_{i+j} + c_{|i-j|}) = 0, \quad i = n+1, \dots, n+m, \quad (26)$$

and the coefficients a_i are determined by the equalities

$$a_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum'_{j=0}^m b_j (c_{i+j} + c_{|i-j|}) = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (27)$$

It is not difficult to verify that this algorithm must lead to the same results as the algorithm described in Section 5 if the calculation errors are not taken into account.

The coefficients c_k for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n+2m$, are present in (26) and (27), i.e., it is necessary to have the first $n+2m+1$ terms of series (24). The coefficients c_k are known, as a rule, only approximately. To determine them one can take the truncated expansion of $f(x)$ into the series in powers of x (the Taylor series) and by means of the well-known economization procedure transform it into the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n+2m} \tilde{c}_i T_i(x). \quad (28)$$

7 Nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximations

A rational function $R(x)$ of the form (1) or (25) is called a *nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant* to the function $f(x)$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$, if

$$\int_{-1}^1 (f(x) - R(x))T_k(x)w(x) dx = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, m + n, \quad (29)$$

where $T_k(x)$ are the Chebyshev polynomials, $w(x) = 1/\sqrt{1-x^2}$.

In the paper [22] the following algorithm of computing the coefficients of the approximant indicated above is given. Let the approximated function $f(x)$ be expanded into series (24) in Chebyshev polynomials. Determine the auxiliary quantities γ_i from the system of linear algebraic equations

$$\sum_{j=0}^m \gamma_j c_{|k-j|} = 0, \quad k = n + 1, n + 2, \dots, n + m, \quad (30)$$

assuming that $\gamma_0 = 1$. The coefficients of the denominator in expression (25) are determined by the relations

$$b_j = \mu \sum_{i=0}^{m-j} \gamma_i \gamma_{i+j},$$

where $\mu^{-1} = 1/2 \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i^2$; this implies $b_0 = 2$. Finally, the coefficients of the numerator are determined by formula (27). It is possible to solve system (30) explicitly and to indicate the formulas for computing the quantities γ_i . One can also estimate explicitly the absolute error of the approximant. This algorithm is described in detail in the book [20]; see also [16].

In contrast to the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants, the nonlinear approximants of this type do not always exist, but it is possible to indicate explicitly verifiable conditions guaranteeing the existence of such approximants [20]. The nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximants (in comparison with the linear ones) have, as a rule, a somewhat smaller absolute errors, but can have larger relative errors. Consider, as an example, the approximant of the form (1) or (25) to the function e^x on the segment $[-1, 1]$ for $m = n = 3$. In this case the absolute error for a nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant is $\Delta = 0.258 \cdot 10^{-6}$, and the relative error, $\delta = 0.252 \cdot 10^{-6}$; for the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant $\Delta = 0.33 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and $\delta = 0.20 \cdot 10^{-6}$.

8 Applications of the computer algebra system REDUCE to the construction of rational approximants

The computer algebra system REDUCE [23] allows us to handle formulas at symbolic level and is a convenient tool for the implementation of algorithms of computing rational approximants. The use of this system allows us to bypass the procedure of working out the algorithm of computing the approximated function if this function is presented in analytical form or when the Taylor series coefficients are known or are determined analytically from a differential equation. The round-off errors can be eliminated by using the exact arithmetic of rational numbers represented in the form of ratios of integers.

Within the framework of the REDUCE system, the program package for enhanced precision computations and construction of rational approximants is implemented; see, for example [4]. In particular, the algorithms from Sections 6 and 7 (which have similar structure) are implemented, the approximated function being first expanded into the power (Taylor) series, $f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(0)x^k/k!$, and then the truncated series

$$\sum_{k=0}^N f^{(k)}(0) \frac{x^k}{k!}, \quad (31)$$

consisting of the first $N + 1$ terms of the Taylor series (the value N is determined by the user) being transformed into a polynomial of the form (28) by means of the economization procedure.

The algorithms implemented by means of the REDUCE system allow us to obtain approximants in the form (1) or (25), estimates of the absolute and the relative error, and the error curves. The output includes the Fortran program of computing the corresponding approximant, the constants of rational arithmetic being transformed into the standard floating point form. When computing the values of the obtained approximant, this approximant can be transformed into the form most convenient for the user. For example, one can calculate values of the numerator and the denominator of the fraction of the form (1) according to the Horner scheme, and for the fraction of the form (25), according to Clenshaw's scheme, and transform the rational expression into a continued fraction or a Jacobi fraction as well.

The ALGOL-like input language of the REDUCE system and convenient tools for solving problems of linear algebra guarantee simplicity and compactness of the programs. For example, the length of the program for computing linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants is 62 lines.

9 Error approximants for linear and nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximations

Relations (29) can be regarded as a system of equations for the coefficients of the approximant. Let the approximants $R(x) = P(x)/Q(x)$ and $\tilde{R}(x) = \tilde{P}(x)/\tilde{Q}(x)$, where $P(x)$, $\tilde{P}(x)$ are polynomials of degree n and $Q(x)$, $\tilde{Q}(x)$ are polynomials of degree m , be obtained by approximate solving the indicated system of equations. Consider the error approximant $\Delta P(x)/\Delta Q(x)$, where $\Delta P(x) = \tilde{P}(x) - P(x)$, $\Delta Q(x) = \tilde{Q}(x) - Q(x)$. Substituting $R(x)$ and $\tilde{R}(x)$ in (29) and subtracting one of the obtained expressions from the other, we see that the following approximate equality holds:

$$\int_{-1}^1 \left(\frac{\tilde{P}(x)}{\tilde{Q}(x)} - \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right) T_k(x) w(x) dx \approx 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, m+n,$$

which directly implies that $\tilde{R}(x) - R(x)$ is close to zero. This and the equality (3) imply the approximate equality

$$\int_{-1}^1 \left(\frac{\Delta P(x)}{\Delta Q(x)} - \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right) \frac{\Delta Q}{\tilde{Q}} T_k(x) w(x) dx \approx 1, \quad (32)$$

where $k = 0, 1, \dots, m+n$, $w(x) = 1/\sqrt{1-x^2}$. If the quantity ΔQ is relatively not small (this is connected with the fact that the system of equations (30) is ill-conditioned), then, as follows from equality (32), we can naturally expect that the error approximant is close to P/Q and, consequently, to the approximated function $f(x)$.

Due to the fact that the arithmetic system of rational numbers is used, the software described in Section 7 allows us to eliminate the round-off errors and to estimate the “pure” influence of errors in the approximated function on the coefficients of the nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant. In this case

the effect of error autocorrection can be substantiated by a more accurate reasoning which is valid both for nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximants and for linear ones, and even for the linear generalized Padé approximants connected with different systems of orthogonal polynomials. This reasoning is analogous to Y. L. Luke’s considerations [13] for the case of classical Padé approximants.

Assume that the function $f(x)$ is expanded into series (24) and that the rational approximant $R(x) = P(x)/Q(x)$ is looked for in the form (25).

Let Δb_j be the errors in coefficients of the approximant’s denominator Q . In the linear case these errors arise when solving the system of equations (26), and in the nonlinear case, when solving the system of equations (27). In both the cases the coefficients in the approximant’s numerator are determined by equations (27), whence we have

$$\Delta a_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{m'} \Delta b_j (c_{i+j} + c_{|i-j|}), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (33)$$

This implies the following fact: the error approximant $\Delta P/\Delta Q$ satisfies the relations

$$\int_{-1}^1 (f(x)\Delta Q(x) - \Delta P(x))T_i(x)w(x) dx = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n, \quad (34)$$

which are analogous to relations (12) defining the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximants. Indeed, let us use the well-known multiplication formula for Chebyshev polynomials:

$$T_i(x)T_j(x) = \frac{1}{2}[T_{i+j}(x) + T_{|i-j|}(x)], \quad (35)$$

where i, j are arbitrary indices; see, for example [16, 20]. Taking (35) into account, the quantity $f\Delta Q - \Delta P$ can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} f\Delta Q - \Delta P &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m'} \Delta b_j T_j \right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i T_i \right) - \sum_{i=0}^n \Delta a_i T_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{m'} \Delta b_j (c_{i+j} + c_{|i-j|}) \right] T_i - \sum_{i=0}^n \Delta a_i T_i. \end{aligned}$$

This formula and (33) imply that

$$f\Delta Q - \Delta P = O(T_{n+1}), \quad (36)$$

i.e., in the expansion of the function $f\Delta Q - \Delta P$ into the series in Chebyshev polynomials, the first $n + 1$ terms *are absent*, and the latter is equivalent to relations (34) by virtue of the fact that the Chebyshev polynomials form an orthogonal system.

Consider an arbitrary rational function of the form (1) or (8)

$$R_{m,n}(x) = \frac{a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n}{b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m} = \frac{P_n(x)}{Q_m(x)}.$$

We shall say that $R_{m,n}(x)$ is a *generalized linear Padé-Chebyshev approximant of order N* to the function $f(x)$ if

$$\int_{-1}^1 \Phi(x) T_k(x) w(x) dx = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N,$$

where $T_k(x) = \cos(k \arccos x)$ are the Chebyshev polynomials, $w(x) = 1/\sqrt{1-x^2}$, $\Phi(x) = f(x)Q_m(x) - P_n(x)$. This means that the first $N + 1$ terms in the expansion of the function $\Phi(x)$ into the series in Chebyshev polynomials (“the Fourier-Chebyshev series”) are absent, i.e.

$$f(x)Q_m(x) - P_n(x) = O(T_{N+1}).$$

If $N = m + n$, then we have the usual linear Padé-Chebyshev approximant discussed above in Section 4. Formula (36) means that the following result is valid.

Theorem. *Let $\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q}$ be the error approximant to $f(x)$ generated by the approximant (25) for the case of linear or nonlinear Padé-Chebyshev approximation and algorithms described in Sections 6 and 7. Then this error approximant $\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta Q}$ is a generalized linear Padé-Chebyshev approximant of order n to the function $f(x)$.*

An equivalent result was discussed in [5, 7]. When carrying out actual computations, the coefficients c_i are known only approximately, and thus the equalities (33), (34) and (35) are also satisfied approximately.

10 Computer experiments for the nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximation

Consider the results of computer experiments that were performed by means of the software implemented in the framework of the REDUCE system and briefly described in Section 7 above. At the author's request, computer calculations were carried out by A. Ya. Rodionov. We begin with the example considered in Section 5 above, where the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant of the form (17) to the function $\cos \frac{\pi}{4}x$ was constructed on the segment $[-1, 1]$ for $m = 2$, $n = 3$. To construct the corresponding nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant, it is necessary to specify the value of the parameter N determining the number of terms in the truncated Taylor series (31) of the approximated function. In this case the calculation error is determined, in fact, by the parameter N .

The coefficients in approximants of the form (17) which are obtained for $N = 15$ and $N = 20$ (the nonlinear case) and the coefficients in the error approximant are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_0 &= 0.4960471034987563, & a_0 &= 0.4960471027757504, \\
\Delta a_0 &= 10^{-8} \cdot 0.07230059, \\
\tilde{a}_1 &= -0.1451091945278387, & a_1 &= -0.1451091928755736, \\
\Delta a_1 &= -10^{-8} \cdot 0.16522651, \\
\tilde{a}_2 &= 10^{-2} \cdot 0.5482586543334515, & a_2 &= 10^{-2} \cdot 0.548258121085953, \\
\Delta a_2 &= -10^{-9} \cdot 0.42224856, \\
\tilde{a}_3 &= -10^{-4} \cdot 0.5205903601778259, & a_3 &= -10^{-4} \cdot 0.5205902238186334, \\
\Delta a_3 &= -10^{-10} \cdot 0.13635919, \\
\tilde{b}_0 &= 0.4960471034987759, & b_0 &= 0.4960471027757698, \\
\Delta b_0 &= 10^{-8} \cdot 0.07230061, \\
\tilde{b}_1 &= 10^{-2} \cdot 0.7884201590727615, & b_1 &= 10^{-2} \cdot 0.7884203019999351, \\
\Delta b_1 &= -10^{-10} \cdot 0.1429272, \\
\tilde{b}_2 &= 10^{-4} \cdot 0.4977097973870693, & b_2 &= 10^{-4} \cdot 0.4977100977750249,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta b_2 = -10^{-10} \cdot 0.300388.$$

Both the approximants have absolute errors Δ equal to $0.4 \cdot 10^{-13}$ and the relative errors δ equal to $0.6 \cdot 10^{-13}$, these values being close to the best possible. The condition number of the system of equations (30) in both the cases is $0.4 \cdot 10^8$. The denominator ΔQ of the error approximant is zero for $x = x_0 \approx 0.70752 \dots$; the point x_0 is also close to the root of the numerator ΔP which for $x = x_0$ is of order 10^{-8} . Such a situation was considered in Section 5 above. Outside a small neighborhood of the point x_0 the absolute and the relative errors have the same order as in the “linear case” considered in Section 5.

Now consider the nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant of the form (17) on the segment $[-1, 1]$ to the function $\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$ for $m = n = 3$. In this case the Taylor series converges very slowly, and, as the parameter N increases, the values of coefficients of the rational approximant undergo substantial (even in the first decimal digits) and intricate changes. The situation is illustrated in Table 2, where the following values are given: the absolute errors Δ , the absolute errors Δ_0 of error approximants (there the approximants are compared for $N = 15$ and $N = 20$, for $N = 25$ and $N = 35$, for $N = 40$ and $N = 50$), and also the values of the condition number *cond* of the system of linear algebraic equations (30). In this case the relative errors coincide with the absolute ones. The best possible error is $\Delta_{\min} = 0.83 \cdot 10^{-17}$. A small neighborhood of the root of the polynomial ΔQ is eliminated as before.

Table 2

N	15	20	25	35	40	50
<i>cond</i>	$0.76 \cdot 10^7$	$0.95 \cdot 10^8$	$0.36 \cdot 10^{10}$	$0.12 \cdot 10^{12}$	$0.11 \cdot 10^{12}$	$0.11 \cdot 10^{12}$
Δ	$0.13 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$0.81 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$0.13 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$0.12 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$0.75 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$0.73 \cdot 10^{-15}$
Δ_0	$0.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$		$0.7 \cdot 10^{-8}$		$0.2 \cdot 10^{-9}$	

11 Small deformations of approximated functions and acceleration of convergence of series

Let a function $f(x)$ be expanded into the series in Chebyshev polynomials, i.e., suppose that $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i T_i$; consider a partial sum

$$\hat{f}_N(x) = \sum_{i=0}^N c_i T_i \quad (37)$$

of this series. Using formula (35), it is easy to verify that the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant of the form (1) or (25) to the function $f(x)$ coincides with the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant to polynomial (37) for $N = n + 2m$, i.e., it depends only on the first $n + 2m + 1$ terms of the Fourier–Chebyshev series of the function $f(x)$; a similar result is valid for the approximant of the form (17) or (18) to even or odd functions, respectively. Note that for $N = n + 2m$ the polynomial $\hat{f}_N$ is the result of application of the algorithm of linear (or nonlinear) Padé–Chebyshev approximation to $f(x)$, the exponents m and n being replaced by 0 and $2m + n$.

The interesting effect mentioned in [2] consists in the fact that the error of the polynomial approximant $\hat{f}_{n+2m}$ depending on $n + 2m + 1$ parameters can exceed the error of the corresponding Padé–Chebyshev approximant of the form (1) which depends only on $n + m + 1$ parameters. For example, consider an approximant of the form (18) to the function $\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$. For $m = n = 3$ the linear Padé–Chebyshev approximant to $\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$ has the error of order 10^{-17} , and the corresponding polynomial approximant of the form (37) has the error of order 10^{-11} . This polynomial of degree 19 (odd functions are in question, and hence $m = n = 3$ in (18) corresponds to $m = 6, n = 7$ in (1)) can be regarded as a result of a deformation of the approximated function $\tan \frac{\pi}{4}x$. This deformation does not affect the first twenty terms in the expansion of this function in Chebyshev polynomials and, consequently, does not affect the coefficients in the corresponding rational Padé–Chebyshev approximant, but leads to an increase of several orders in its error. Thus, *a small deformation of the approximated function can result in a sharp change in the order of error of a rational approximant.*

Moreover the effect just mentioned means that the algorithm extracts an additional information concerning the next components of the Fourier–

Chebyshev series from the polynomial (37). In other words, in this case the transition from the Fourier–Chebyshev series to the corresponding Padé–Chebyshev approximant accelerates convergence of the series. A similar effect of acceleration of convergence of power series by passing to the classical Padé approximant is known (see, e.g., [16]).

It is easy to see that the nonlinear Padé–Chebyshev approximant of the form (1) to the function $f(x)$ depends only on the first $m + n + 1$ terms of the Fourier–Chebyshev series for $f(x)$, so that for such approximants a more pronounced effect of the type indicated above takes place.

Since one can change the “tail” of the Fourier–Chebyshev series in a quite arbitrary way without affecting the rational Padé–Chebyshev approximant, the effect of acceleration of convergence can take place only for the series with an especially regular behavior (and for the corresponding “well-behaved” functions). See [5, 7] for some details.

12 Error autocorrection and Interval Analysis

Undoubtedly one of the most actual problems in Interval Analysis in the sense of [8]–[10] is to get realistic interval estimates for calculation errors, i.e. to get efficient estimates close to the virtual calculation errors. Difficulties arise where intermediate errors compensate each other. For the sake of simplicity let us suppose that we calculate values of a real smooth function $z = F(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ of real variables $y_1, \dots, y_N$, and suppose that all round-off errors are negligible with respect to input data errors. This situation is especially examined in the framework of Ju.V. Matijasevich’s “a posteriori interval analysis”, see, e.g., [10]. In this case the error ΔF of $F(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ can be evaluated by the formula

$$\Delta F = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \cdot \Delta y_i + r, \quad (38)$$

where r is negligible. The sum $\sum_{i=1}^N (\partial F / \partial y_i) \cdot \Delta y_i$ in (38) can be treated as a scalar product of the gradient vector $\{\partial F / \partial y_i\}$ and the vector of errors $\{\Delta y_i\}$.

The effect of error autocorrection corresponds to the case, where the gradient $\{\partial F/\partial y_i\}$ is not small but the scalar product is small enough. In this case these vectors are almost orthogonal and the following approximate equation holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \cdot \Delta y_i \approx 0 \quad (39)$$

This effect is typical for some ill-posed problems.

For all the standard interval methods, the best possible estimation for ΔF is given by the formula

$$|\Delta F| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_i} \right| \cdot |\Delta y_i|. \quad (40)$$

This estimate is good if the errors Δy_i are “independent” but it is not realistic in the case discussed in this paper (calculation of values of rational approximants when the error autocorrection effect works). In this case

$$F(y_1, \dots, y_N) = R(x, a_0, \dots, a_n, b_0, \dots, b_m) = \frac{a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \dots + a_n x^n}{b_0 + b_1 x + b_2 x^2 + \dots + b_m x^m},$$

where $N = m + n + 3$, $\{y_1, \dots, y_N\} = \{x, a_0, \dots, a_n, b_0, \dots, b_m\}$. For the sake of simplicity let us suppose that $\Delta x = 0$. In this case we can use the equality (22) to transform the formula (38) into the formula

$$\Delta R \approx \frac{\Delta P}{Q} - \frac{P \Delta Q}{Q^2} = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{x^i}{Q(x)} \Delta a_i + \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{P(x) x^j}{Q^2(x)} \Delta b_j. \quad (41)$$

So the estimation (39) transforms into the estimation

$$\Delta R \leq \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{|x^i|}{|Q(x)|} \cdot |\Delta a_i| + \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{|P(x) x^j|}{|Q^2(x)|} \cdot |\Delta b_j|. \quad (42)$$

It is easy to check that estimations of this type are not realistic. Consider the following example discussed in Introduction: $f(x) = \arctan x$ on the segment $[-1, 1]$, $R(x)$ has the form (1) for $m = 8$, $n = 9$. In this case the estimation (41) is of order 10^{-4} but in fact ΔR is of order 10^{-11} . This situation is typical for examples examined in this paper. In fact we have an approximate equation

$$\Delta R \approx \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{x^i}{Q(x)} \Delta a_i + \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{P(x) x^j}{Q^2(x)} \Delta b_j \approx \varepsilon \approx 0, \quad (43)$$

where ε is the absolute error of the used approximation method. Of course, this approximate equation holds if our approximation method is good and the uncertainty relation (discussed above in Section 2) is valid. Then approximate equation (43) corresponds to the approximate equation (39).

The error autocorrection effect appears not only in rational approximation but in many problems. Other examples (where this effect occurs in a weaker form) are the method of least squares and some popular methods for the numerical integration of ordinary and partial differential equations, see, e.g., [24]–[29].

In principle the error autocorrection effect appears if input data form an (approximate) solution (or solutions) of an equation (or equations or systems of equations). Then the corresponding errors could form an approximate solution (or solutions) for another equation (or equations or systems of equations). As a result this could lead to corrections for standard interval estimates.

Of course, in the theory we can include all the preliminary numerical problems to our concrete problem and to use, e.g., a posteriori interval analysis for the “united” problem. However, in practice this is not convenient.

In practice situations of this kind often appear if we use approximate solutions to ill conditioned systems of linear algebraic equations. If the condition number of the system is great and the residual of the solution (with respect to the system) is small, then our software must send us a “warning”. This means that an additional investigation for error estimates is needed. In the theory of interval analysis this corresponds to a further development of “a posteriori interval methods” in the spirit of [10], [27]–[30].

Remark. We have discussed “smooth” computations. Note that for many “nonsmooth” optimization problems all the interval estimates could be good and absolutely exact. A situation of this kind (related to solving systems of linear algebraic equations over idempotent semirings) is described in [31].

References

- [1] G.L. Litvinov et al., *Mathematical Algorithms and Programs for Small Computers*, Finansy i Statistika Publ., Moscow, 1981 (in Russian).

- [2] G.L. Litvinov and V.N. Fridman, Approximate construction of rational approximants, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci., 36, No. 1 (1981), 49–52 (in Russian).
- [3] I.A. Andreeva, G. L. Litvinov, A. Ya. Rodionov and V. N. Fridman, *The PADE-program for Calculation of Rational Approximants. The Program Specification and its Code*, Fond Algoritmov i Programm NIVTs AN SSSR, Puschino, 1985 (in Russian).
- [4] A.P. Kryukov, G.L. Litvinov and A.Ya. Rodionov, Construction of rational approximations by means of REDUCE, in: *Proceeding of the ACM-SIGSAM Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (SYM-SAC 86)*, Univ. of Waterloo, Canada, 1986, pp. 31–33.
- [5] G.L. Litvinov, Approximate construction of rational approximations and an effect of error autocorrection, in: *Mathematics and Modeling*, NIVTs AN SSSR, Puschino, 1990, 99–141 (in Russian).
- [6] G.L. Litvinov, Error auto-correction in rational approximation, *Interval Computations*, 4 (6), (1992), 14–18.
- [7] G.L. Litvinov, Approximate construction of rational approximations and the effect of error autocorrection. Applications, *Russian J. Math. Phys.*, 1, No. 3 (1994), 14–18.
- [8] G. Alefeld and J. Herzberger, *Introduction to Interval Computations*, Academic Press, New York–London, 1983.
- [9] R.B. Kearfott, Interval computations – introduction, uses, and resources, *Euromath. Bulletin*, 2(1), (1996), 95–112.
- [10] Y. Matijasevich, A posteriori version of interval analysis, in: *Proc. Fourth Hung. Computer Sci. Conf., Topics in the Theoretical Basis and Applications of Computer Science*, eds. M. Arato, I. Katai, L. Varga, Acad. Kiado, Budapest, 1986, pp. 339–349.
- [11] J.F. Hart et al., *Computer Approximations*, Wiley, New York, 1968.
- [12] V.V. Voevodin, *Numerical Principles of Linear Algebra*, Nauka Publ., Moscow, 1977 (in Russian).

- [13] Y.L. Luke, Computations of coefficients in the polynomials of Padé approximations by solving systems of linear equations, *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 6, No. 3 (1980), 213–218.
- [14] Y.L. Luke, A note on evaluation of coefficients in the polynomials of Padé approximants by solving systems of linear equations, *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 8, No. 2 (1982), 93–99.
- [15] G.E. Forsythe, M. Malcolm and C. Moler, *Computer Methods for Mathematical Computations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1977.
- [16] G.A. Baker and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants. Part I: Basic Theory. Part II: Extensions and Applications*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematics and its Applications 13, 14, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1981.
- [17] W.J. Cody, W. Fraser and J.F. Hart, Rational Chebyshev approximation using linear equations, *Numer. Math.*, 12 (1968) 242–251.
- [18] E.W. Cheney, *Introduction to Approximation Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
- [19] D.S. Lubinsky and A. Sidi, Convergence of linear and nonlinear Padé approximants from series of orthogonal polynomials, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 278, No. 1, (1983) 333–345.
- [20] S. Paszkowski, *Zastosowania Numeryczne Wielomianów i Szeregów Czebyszewa*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa, 1975 (in Polish).
- [21] H.J. Maehly, Rational approximations for transcendental functions, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Processing*, UNESCO, Butterworths, London, 1960, pp. 57–62.
- [22] C.K. Clenshaw and K. Lord, Rational approximations from Chebyshev series, in: *Studies in Numerical Analysis*, ed. B.K.P. Scaife, Academic Press, London and New York, 1974, pp. 95–113.
- [23] A.C. Hearn, *REDUCE User's Manual*, Rand. Publ., 1982.

- [24] E.A. Volkov, *Two-sided difference methods for solving linear boundary-value problems for ordinary differential equations*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 128 (1972), 131–152 (translated from Russian by AMS in 1974).
- [25] E.A. Volkov, *Pointwise estimates of the accuracy of a difference solution of a boundary-value problem for an ordinary differential equation*, Differential Equations, vol. 9, No 4 (1973), 717–726 (in Russian; translated into English by Plenum Publ. Co. in 1975, 545–552).
- [26] B.S. Dobronets and V.V. Shaydurov, *Two-sided numerical methods*, Nauka Publ., Novosibirsk, 1990 (in Russian).
- [27] B.S. Dobronets, *On some two-sided methods for solving systems of ordinary differential equations*, Interval Computations, No 1(3) (1992), 6–21.
- [28] B.S. Dobronets, *Interval methods based on a posteriori estimates*, Interval Computations, No 3(5) (1992), 50–55.
- [29] L.F. Shampine, Ill-conditioned matrices and the integration of stiff ODEs, J. of Computational and Applied Mathematics 48 (1993), 279–292.
- [30] Yu.V. Matijasevich, *Real numbers and computers*. – In: Kibernetika i Vychislitel'naya Tekhnika, vol. 2 (1986), 104–133 (in Russian).
- [31] G.L. Litvinov and A.S. Sobolevskii, *Idempotent interval analysis and optimization problems*, Reliable Computing 7 (2001), 353–377.